

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
FLORENCE DIVISION

William Cory Mullins,	)	Civil Action No.: 4:16-cv-03983-RBH-TER
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
v.	)	<b>ORDER</b>
	)	
Nucor Corporation,	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	
_____	)	

This matter is before the Court for review of the Report and Recommendation (“R & R”) of United States Magistrate Judge Thomas E. Rogers, III, made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Local Rule 73.02(B)(2)(g) for the District of South Carolina. *See* R & R, ECF No. 17. The Magistrate Judge recommends that the Court grant Defendant’s Partial Motion to Dismiss [ECF No. 4] and dismiss Plaintiff’s cause of action for wrongful termination in violation of public policy with prejudice. R & R at 3.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to the Court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility to make a final determination remains with the Court. *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 270-71 (1976). The Court must conduct a de novo review of those portions of the R & R to which specific objections are made, and it may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge or recommit the matter with instructions. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

Neither party has filed objections to the R & R, and the time for doing so has expired.<sup>1</sup> In the absence of objections to the R & R, the Court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the

---

<sup>1</sup> Objections were due by February 23, 2017. *See* ECF No. 17.

Magistrate Judge’s recommendations. *See Camby v. Davis*, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983). The Court reviews only for clear error in the absence of an objection. *See Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (stating that “in the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct de novo review, but instead must ‘only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation’” (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee’s note)).

After a thorough review of the record in this case, the Court finds no clear error and therefore adopts and incorporates by reference the R & R [ECF No. 17] of the Magistrate Judge. Accordingly, the Court **GRANTS** Defendant’s Partial Motion to Dismiss [ECF No. 4] and **DISMISSES** Plaintiff’s cause of action for wrongful termination in violation of public policy *with prejudice*. The Court **RECOMMITS** this case to the Magistrate Judge for further pretrial handling.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Florence, South Carolina  
March 6, 2017

s/ R. Bryan Harwell  
R. Bryan Harwell  
United States District Judge